DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 560 FL 002 022

AUTHOR	Raeburn, David
TITLE	Performing Greek Tragedy in School-I, II.
INSTITUTION	Joint Association of Classical Teachers, Oxford (England).
PUB DATE	64
NOTE	18p.
JOURNAL CIT	Didaskalos; v1 n1 p113-121 1963, v1 n2 p124-132 1964
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Acting, Classical Literature, Cultural Enrichment, Drama, *Dramatics, Dramatic Unities, *Greek, Greek Literature, Instructional Program Divisions, *Production Techniques, *Secondary Schools, Theater Arts, Theaters, *Tragedy

ABSTRACT

This booklet addresses itself to the problem of whether Greek tragedy can be produced today in schools as a vital theatrical experience. The main thesis of the first of two articles points out that while a producer's first concern must be to communicate the context and spirit of a particular drama to a modern audience, he must also bring out the formal and esthetic qualities which are implicit in the ancient conventions. It is suggested that features to be emphasized include messenger-narratives, formal debates between characters, and particularly the chorus. The second paper explores some practical consequences of these general considerations noting that every play has its own unique problems of presentation. (RL)

from: Didaskalos; v1 n1 p113-121 1963
Didaskalos; v1 n2 p124-132 1964

Performing Greek Tragedy in School - I

DAVID RAEBURN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED047560

FL002027

Drama is now an established part of our educational curriculum Should Greek Tragedy occupy a regular place in the repertoire? Enthusiastic teachers of Classics may claim with some fairness that the best way of putting a Greek play across to our pupils is to make them act it and so identify themselves with the characters as creatures of flesh and blood in real situations. Furthermore, if the play is given in the original, the Greek tongue is suddenly revealed no longer as a series of difficult paradigms but as a living language in all its majesty. There is another more cynical school of thought which holds that performances of this kind, particularly those given in the original, are no more than a pious tribute to our classical heritage and, though we hardly dare admit it even to ourselves, an unmitigated bore for the audience, if not for all concerned.

This point about the audience is cardinal. Drama is essentially a form of communication and depends on a relationship of mutual response between actors and audience. If, as happens all too often, a Greek Tragedy can only inspire the reactions of ennui or mirth, the production may have been a worthy, though time-consuming, piece of classical 'group project work', but it will hardly be valid as a dramatic experience. Fortunately that need not be the case. School performances of Greek plays have been given, both in the original and in translation, which have not only delighted devotees of the Classics, but have also

surprised and excited spectators who attended reluctantly from a sense of duty.

It must be emphasized, though, that this result depends on a great deal of careful thought and diligent preparation. The old adage that, if something is worth doing at all, it is worth doing well was never more true than here. But if we insist on a form and standard of presentation which will really engage an audience's sympathy and attention, the whole enterprise ceases to be a mere adjunct to our classical teaching and becomes a form of education in its own right. No less than with Shakespeare, to give boys or girls the chance of becoming familiar with one of the Greek tragic masterpieces through taking part in an imaginative and well-rehearsed production is to add to their experience and awareness as human beings. In addition, there can be few aesthetic lessons so valuable as that of coming into such intimate contact with the Greek sense of unity and form which produced such economical and perfectly balanced works of art.

There is no need, then, for the Greek Play to be confined to the Classics Department and no reason why one of the great tragedies should not be chosen for performance in translation as the main School Play, given an intelligent producer who will be alive to the special problems which these plays present. The thoughts and feelings expressed in them may well be immediate to our own experience, but in point of dramatic form Greek Tragedy is remote from the theatre to-day. The aim of this and one further article is to suggest how some of the difficulties can be approached.

But before embarking on this discussion, it may be as well to insist that the unfamiliar idiom of Greek Tragedy should not distract our attention from those basic respects in which a Greek play needs to be treated like any other play of whatever period. It is axiomatic that a producer should fully 'understand' the particular text of which he is to be the interpreter, entering into sympathetic communion with the mind of the dramatist and discovering the central theme, if one is there,

which represents the core of the play's meaning. The means must be found of presenting the plot and interplay of personalities as clearly as possible to the audience. The play's emotional impact as a piece of 'theatre' must be carefully measured and the requisite effects achieved with technical assurance. A decision must be made for the actors' guidance as to how far the characterization should be realistic or formalized (the answer here will certainly differ for each of the three Attic tragedians). Above all, a producer must ensure that the sum total of so much concerted endeavour is a satisfying artistic unity. No consideration of the formal problems of presenting Greek Tragedy should blind us to the special requirements implicit in the content of each individual play.

One other preliminary question is best considered now. What are the relative merits of acting Greek plays in the original and in translation? It is obvious that in several vital respects a translation is only a pale shadow of the original. Not only is some distortion of meaning inevitable, but rhetoric is at the heart of the Greek tragic style and modern English is not rhetorical; while most of the translators, whether rightly or wrongly, have shied off reproducing the exciting complexities of the choral metres and substituted more commonplace rhythms of their own. To one familiar with a text in Greek, a modern English version can appear, for sheer sound, as inadequate as one of Wagner's most sumptuous orchestral effects played on the piano. On the other hand, a translation has the undeniable advantage of intelligibility. When Professors of Greek sit through performances at Bradfield College with texts on their knees, what hope is there for the vast majority of the audience with their small Greek or even none? More, in fact, than one would imagine, to judge from the response of many 'un-Greeked' visitors to Bradfield who discovered that, with the aid of a synopsis, they could derive the same sort of pleasure from Aeschylus or Sophocles as they obtained from hearing an opera in a foreign language. Nevertheless, to miss the detailed meaning is a major loss.

Again, the fact must be faced that a performance in Greek takes at least twice as long to prepare. Before the actors can start to rehearse their movements on the stage, they must be trained to speak their lines with accuracy in pronunciation and phrasing and with the confidence which only comes from familiarity and understanding. Without this thorough spadework the labour will be in vain. And are we to restrict the cast to our Greek-speaking pupils, who may not be the best actors available? A talented Oedipus or Medea will be indispensable. The custom at Bradfield has been, if necessary, to cast even the longest roles from outside the classical ranks and this, with all the additional work involved, is justified by a distinguished tradition and the eagerness of visitors, especially from other schools, to make the triennial pilgrimage to see a Greek Play in the College's beautiful open-air theatre. But for most schools this practice, even if it were feasible, could hardly be recommended.

One is forced to the conclusion that a good performance in the original, while immensely valuable for the actors and by no means unrewarding for a non-specialist audience, is bound to be a highly ambitious venture which can only be attempted in special circumstances. For the most part, we must be content to use translations, especially if we mean to justify our productions on general educational rather than on departmental grounds. We need to choose good modern versions, not because the old ones like Gilbert Murray's were bad (some of them were, in their own way, better), but because they are now outmoded. In practice, the best of the new translations, such as Louis MacNeice's *Agamemnon*, are thoroughly actable and can indeed be most effective.

We can now proceed to our main question: how can a tragedy composed for performance at Athens in the 5th century B.C. be revived for an audience nearly 2,500 years later? There are three possible lines of approach.

The first is to reconstruct, as closely as is possible, the conditions of the original performance. Here we come up against difficulties at every turn, as the evidence for the 5th century is sketchy,

beyond what we can legitimately infer from the texts of the plays themselves. Assuming we could supplement by conjecture what we know of the stage architecture, scenery, costumes and masks, we should have little to go on when it came to instructing our actors and chorus, apart from a few characteristic attitudes and ritual gestures which can be found in the friezes and vase-paintings. On the vital matter of chorus grouping and movement, for example, we should be almost completely in the dark. But even if there were ready answers to all the questions we should need to ask, the result would be of antiquarian interest only, simply because a modern audience comes to the theatre in a different spirit and with different preconceptions from those of the 5th century Athenian. It is obvious that fashions in production changed even among the ancients themselves. A posthumous revival of the *Oresteia* in the new Periclean Theatre doubtless involved many departures from Aeschylus' original *didaskalia* a few decades earlier. At all events, many details in the ancient method of presentation would certainly strike a modern spectator as so curious as to be merely quaint, if not positively distracting. The music, surely, would be so weirdly unfamiliar as to stand in the way of our enjoyment. It is even highly doubtful whether masks, about which we have some evidence and without which an ancient performance was unthinkable, are a help or a hindrance to appreciation today.

Another approach is to go to the opposite extreme and to approximate as far as possible to modern theatrical conditions. The argument runs thus: 'This play is worth reviving because it still has a meaning for our own times. We must therefore persuade our audience into seeing it as something contemporary. They must forget, in fact, that it comes from ancient Greece. To preserve the meaning, we must alter the form'. A production of the *Troades* given by Belgian students in French a few years ago was conceived on these lines as an up-to-date indictment of the horrors of war, and steps were taken to obscure the ancient conventions. For example, the long set speeches were severely cut, the opening dialogue between the two gods Poseidon and

Athene was relayed in semi-darkness over a loudspeaker, while the Chorus of captive Trojan women was completely deformalized and consisted of four individual characters, two male and two female, who were interspersed over the stage among the principal actors. The result was an interesting experiment after the manner of Anouilh or Giraudoux and a point was made, but something of the essential Euripides was missing. Part of the play's truth may have been revealed, but little of its beauty was manifest, and it seems a fallacy to suppose that the content of drama can be so violently divorced from its aesthetic without some distortion of the meaning itself.

Clearly we need to attempt a synthesis between these two approaches. Here it is helpful to consider the principle which has guided the performance of Shakespeare during the last half-century. It was William Poel who started the reaction against the spectacular productions of Irving and Beerbohm Tree, in which scenic considerations had been allowed to dictate the transposition of scenes, large-scale 'cuts' and frequent interruptions to the play's continuity, which all combined to destroy its essential rhythm and thus much of the dramatic effect. In reintroducing the Elizabethan method of staging, Poel demonstrated the importance of a respected text, musical verse-speaking and, above all, of uninterrupted continuity between scenes, but his productions seemed too drab and academic to catch the public imagination. The right solution was found by Harley Granville Barker, who realized that it was neither necessary nor desirable to reconstruct the Globe if we wanted to do Shakespeare full justice. In his own productions he aimed to revive rather than to reconstruct the original theatrical experience, in the light of what we know about the Elizabethan theatre but also remembering the tastes and preconceptions of the 20th century. By using stage settings which were modern in style but allowed the action to proceed unbroken, he established the basic pattern which, despite their many superficial variations, almost all productions of Shakespeare follow today.

We must apply the same line of thought to the production of

Greek Tragedy. It is not enough to admire its substance. We have to ask what formal features are an indispensable part of the dramatic experience and fully master the point of the ancient conventions, so that if we decide to compromise, we at least know what we are compromising with.

Perhaps the most striking formal characteristic of Greek Tragedy is its structure, as clearly defined in its way as that of a Doric temple. We are not speaking here of plot structure, important as this must be to the producer (the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, for example, is typical of a shape which slowly builds up to a single great climax and then relaxes to a quiet ending). Much more remarkable is the way in which Athenian drama, with its startlingly rapid development from early Aeschylus to late Sophocles and Euripides, remains set in the same basic stereotype, with prologue, parados, episodes alternating with stasima or kommoi, and exodos. Each of these phases needs to be thought of as a clear-cut 'movement' in the musical sense as much as a 'scene'. The whole genre indeed bears certain external resemblances to 18th century opera or oratorio. Of these the employment of a chorus is the most obvious, but the long rhetorical set speeches have the dignity of great arias, with *stichomythia* rather nearer to the level of recitative. Again, the *kommoi* are not embarrassing and turgid expressions of protracted grief but peculiarly moving 'numbers' for soloist and chorus which offer producer and actors a special opportunity.

It is worth reminding ourselves how Tragedy came to assume this particular form. The origins of Tragedy may be a vexed question, but it seems reasonably certain that Thespis' original performance amounted to a marriage of two pre-existing art forms, choral lyric and epic narrative. In other words, Tragedy begins with a Chorus and a Messenger[1]. Later on, when Aeschylus introduced the second *hypokrites* or 'answerer' who could

[1] This, surely, is the simple reason for the Messenger convention rather than Greek reluctance to show scenes of horror on stage. Not all the Messenger speeches report catastrophe and certain visible moments, e.g. the Furies on Orestes' trail, the agonies of Philoctetes, or Agave with Pentheus' head in her arms, are horrific enough.

reply not only to the questions of the Chorus but also to the first actor, a new element of conflict became possible. Hence the *agon* or formal debate between characters which was such an important feature in Euripides. We may say, then, that the Chorus, the Messenger and powerful conflicts between two personalities or points of view are the very stuff out of which Greek Tragedy is made and that a production which fails to high-light these features as such is in danger of going astray.

We must also remember that for the Greeks, at least to begin with, the Chorus came first. This is not only evident from the predominance of the choral element in early Aeschylus but from the root meanings of terms such as 'episode' and 'prologue' which imply that it is the actors who are intruding upon the Chorus and not the other way round. Nor must we forget that the Chorus is in essence performing acts of ritual, deriving from hymns to the gods sung and danced at a religious festival. Many movements preserve the character of specific religious acts, such as the invocation of Agamemnon's ghost in the *Choephoroe*, but all the long explorations of the past in the *Agamemnon* choruses are great acts of ritual in which, for all the Elders' good-will, words of bad omen are found to triumph over good and so in themselves help to seal Agamemnon's doom more and more irrevocably. In the *Oresteia*, in fact, ritual is no mere outward form but right at the heart of the poet's dramatic technique. We can be sure that in such cases the Athenian audience did more than watch a magnificent spectacle or listen to a choir singing ritual songs as part of a familiar myth dramatized for their entertainment. The context in which they visited the theatre was that of a religious festival. Their frame of mind was more that of a 'congregation' than an audience, for they sat in their thousands as a united community round the orchestra, in the midst of which the Chorus solemnly processed about the altar of Dionysus.

Naturally we cannot hope to reproduce this kind of atmosphere with Greek Tragedy today, but the ritual element is something we cannot ignore in our treatment even of plays composed

when tragedy had become more secular and the choral portions more like interludes. Even then the feeling that the audience itself was part of the play was not entirely lost, for the Chorus never abandoned its intermediary role as a link between actors and audience, at times closely involved in the main action and at others, even in the same play, as detached from it as the spectators[2]. This 'linking' function made it perfectly natural in practice for Attic Tragedy to preserve the 'gnomic' aspect of Dorian choral lyric and to use the Chorus' general moral utterances as a means of universalizing the particular action and of pointing to a central idea in the mind of the poet. Needless to say, the poets were usually skilful enough to integrate the lyric element with the flow of the narrative. Transitions of thought between episode and stasimon may be abrupt, but each ode contributes logically to the *emotional* continuum, the calculated succession of responses which the dramatist hopes to excite in his audience. It is a producer's task, at every stage, carefully and intelligently to assess the complex contribution made to the play as a whole by this subtle instrument, the Chorus.

[2]Such a shift of dramatic ground on the Chorus' part is very well seen in the *Oedipus Coloneus*.

DAVID RAEBURN

Performing Greek Tragedy in School II

DAVID RAEBURN

How, in practical terms, can Greek Tragedy be produced today so as to be a vital theatrical experience? The main thesis of the previous article was that, while a producer's first concern must be to communicate the context and spirit of a particular drama to a modern audience, he must also bring out the formal and aesthetic qualities which are implicit in the ancient conventions. Features to emphasize included a play's stereotyped structure and division into clear-cut movements like an eighteenth century opera; messenger-narratives and formal debates between characters; and, above all, the Chorus, with its ritualistic origins, linking the action and the audience. We have now to explore some practical consequences of these general considerations, without forgetting that each play has its own special problems to be solved and that no single formula can be dogmatically prescribed.

One point, however, may be made with little hesitation. A Greek tragedy should be presented without an interval if it is not to be spoilt as a dramatic organism. The emotional effect very often consists in the tension slowly but inexorably mounting towards the catastrophic climax, and in such cases any interruption is disastrous. Indeed, it is impossible in most plays to find a convenient stopping-point, as the choral odes tend to preserve the continuum by not only relating to the episodes they succeed but also anticipating the action which follows.

These plays were clearly designed to be acted without a break, and a good performance of two hours or so should not be too long for an audience to endure and enjoy.

It is also suggested that a text should normally be presented uncut. Unlike Shakespeare, the Greek tragedians did not insert little scenes that were inessential to the main design. The economy which their cast of three actors dictated is indeed one of their greatest strengths. Even if the logic of a play's argument is not disturbed by an omission, its internal symmetry and proportions may well suffer. The poets conform remarkably closely to Aristotle's canon of unity that the parts of a play must be so arranged that any transposition or omission will disturb the whole. This principle can be seen even in the construction of individual speeches and choral odes.

Passing now to the actual staging, what kind of treatment will be best? A school that can boast an open-air arena theatre is, without doubt, ideally suited. If the play is one in which the Chorus plays an important role, then only a theatre with an *orchestra* or the equivalent which allows the audience to sit in horseshoe formation will revive the ritualistic atmosphere and create the right spatial relationship between principal actors and audience with Chorus as the link. On the other hand, many successful productions have taken place on ordinary school-hall platforms within the 'picture-frame' convention. Certain plays such as the *Philoctetes*, in which the Chorus has a less prominent function, will suffer little this way. We must simply make the best of what we have and, if necessary, improvise some kind of forestage when the Chorus is to be a main feature.

Very little scenery will be necessary or desirable. Much will depend on our stage and the needs of the particular play. In general, a Greek tragedy will be better served by stylized, architectural décor than by archaeological realism. The set should not draw attention to itself, but provide a pleasing background against which the characters and their costumes can stand out in strong relief.

11

Good costuming is a far more important charge on the budget. Dresses should, if possible, be specially designed for each production in a simple but striking colour scheme which will express the play's dominant mood and illustrate the relationship between the different characters. The basic garment is only a rectangular piece of material, and the real skill lies in the draping. It will add greatly to the richness of the presentation if the costumes are decorated by painting, printing or needlework in suitable designs (the vases are a useful source), but this is not essential. The main point is that the dresses should be imaginatively and appropriately planned as a whole. Trouble taken here can pay vast dividends.

It is a moot point whether the actors should wear masks. These may well make a production impressive and ritualistic, but here surely we must recognize the different preconceptions of ancient and modern playgoers. To the fifth century Athenian masks were an accepted part of the theatrical ritual, necessitated by the size of the auditorium and the frequent 'quick changes' that the three actors had to make. To us, however, they seem quaint, if not actually distracting. We expect our actors to use their faces as a principal means of expression and by clapping masks on to them we are imposing a severe restriction on the communication of personality which is vital to the experience of all drama. A compromise solution is the half-mask which leaves the mouth free and so affords some facial animation while avoiding the danger of muffled diction. A similar ploy is to use stylized wigs and make-up for all the characters, with special insistence on uniformity in the Chorus. This is expensive but perhaps the most satisfactory answer.

If the music department is prepared to help, a talented composer can contribute much to the atmosphere and lyrical character of the drama, though a full setting of the choral odes is not advisable, except perhaps in special moments like hymns and prayers. The music should enhance, not compete with the poetry, and what matters is that the words of the text should be clearly delivered. Occasionally a discreet instrumental ac-

12

companiment to the spoken word, such as a woodwind instrument *obbligato* during a formal lament, can be effective, and much can be done with percussion to mark the rhythm or to heighten moments of tension. Music is most usefully employed 'incidentally', at the beginning of the play or to cover long entrances and exits. In their choice of idiom, composers tend to adopt a pseudo-archaic style with reedy instrumentation or else to be frankly modern and vary the scoring to suit the mood of the play. Each of these solutions has its merits, provided that the result is simple and undistracting.

So much for the external details of the presentation. On what lines should the producer direct the action? One of the hardest things is to achieve the right overall tempo. The pace will have to be on the slow side if we are to convey the spacious grandeur of Greek Tragedy, but the underlying tension must never be allowed to slacken. Any dragging will be fatal. Everything depends on the speaking of the verse, and here the actors should be given expert and detailed guidance *before they start learning their parts*, whether they are to perform in the original or in translation.

The principals especially will need help over the delivery of the long speeches. These are, as has been suggested, like great operatic arias, and demand something of a singer's technique and control of detail. The first step will be to analyse the 'architecture' or rhetorical structure of a *rhesis*. In modern translations it is not always easy, because of the shorter sentences, to establish the main periods, but here a glance at the original will make it plain where the heavy stops should be placed. Each period can then be appropriately phrased so as to reach its climax in pitch and volume on the correct line. The relative intensity of those climaxes should also be gauged to ensure that the speech as a whole builds up to its own high peak. This is not the place to discuss the art of verse-speaking; but clear enunciation, breath control, modulation of pitch and subtle variations in tempo are at the heart of the matter, and trouble taken over these points early on in rehearsal will guar-

antee an attentive audience for our *agons* and messenger-speeches better than anything else.

Stichomythia also presents its special difficulties. Its effect beside the great speeches will be like *recitativo secco*, with the brisker pace required for the rapid interchange of dialogue. There is a risk of this becoming a flat series of questions and answers. Voice inflexion must be suitably varied to convey the nuances of meaning, and skilful timing is essential. Young actors need to be taught not only to anticipate their cues but also how to hold a pause, a particularly valuable point of technique in acting Greek Tragedy.

If we attach this emphasis to the delivery of the lines, only a minimum of skill is required over movement and gesture. In fact, little movement is necessary, for any fussiness in this respect will spoil the dignity of the style. The general effect should be still rather than static or statuesque, and this can be achieved if the actors are trained to carry themselves well in their costumes, with their weight correctly distributed, and only to make a move when the action or a break in a long speech makes it natural. Above all, they must be relaxed, for it is this which will give a sense of life and movement even in repose. Gestures will be most telling if they are used economically, but then they must be broad and significant. For characteristic attitudes expressing mourning and the like, help can be obtained from the ancient monuments, but any artificial attempt to imitate the friezes will result in self-conscious mannerisms and fail to bring the substance of the play alive.

Perhaps the greatest technical challenge to the producer lies in the treatment of the Chorus. All too often the odes emerge in performance as tedious interludes for platitudinous moralizing or mythological comparison, uttered in portentous tones by dreary elders or earnest maidens. They should, instead, be regarded as an opportunity to lift the play on to a higher level of emotional intensity; and with imaginative handling this can be done.

The first thing is to assess the function of each choral movement in the play's dramatic continuum. It may be a stylized form of

action or a reflection on a theme which points the universal significance of the myth; or if the content of an ode does not seem to bear closely on the main plot, its mood will have some relation, whether by way of reinforcement or contrast, to the episodes which precede and follow. Once he has decided what effect the dramatist intended, the producer must then devise the means of recreating it. Each ode should suggest its own treatment, and the suggestions which follow are intended only as a general guide.

As a rule, the Chorus should represent a single corporate personality rather than a collection of individuals with differing points of view. Its utterances should not be reminiscent of a mothers' meeting or parochial church council, but make the vivid impact of concerted ritual. The members need not speak in unison the whole time so long as the formal style makes it plain that one speaks for all. The famous scene in the *Agamemnon* when each elder reacts differently to the king's death-cries is the exception which proves the rule. Clytemnestra's murder of her husband represents a disharmony in the world order, and Aeschylus could have chosen no more effective way of expressing this than by dissolving his Chorus, usually so united, into twelve separate crusty old men.

The number of choreutae will depend on the actors available, the size of our stage and the character of the play itself. The more majestic dramas will obviously lose weight if the number falls below a dozen or ten; but the lighter, more satirical, tragedies of Euripides, in which the Chorus plays a less significant role, will hardly suffer with a group of six or seven or even fewer.

How should the choruses be delivered? It has already been suggested that normally the odes are better spoken than sung, if the meaning of the text is to be plain. The excitement must lie in the rhythm. If the play is given in the original, an audience will listen in rapt attention if the basic metrical pulse is well emphasized. This may mean marking an unnatural stress which the Greek spoken word would never have had, but it is the

nearest equivalent we can achieve to the exhilarating effect of the strophe as sung and danced in ancient times. That the metre was an essential part of this effect will be obvious to anyone who has practised rhythmically reading, say, the agitated dochmiacs which precede the news of Pentheus' death in the *Bacchae*. In translation much will be lost, but even there a sense of rhythm is all-important.

For further and more varied interest, the different voices of the Chorus can be used as instruments for which the lines are 'scored'. Some solo speaking will certainly be advisable, as the content of a particular phrase or group of phrases may well suit a voice with a special colour or depth. At other points it will be appropriate to have two or three choreutae or a semi-chorus speaking in unison, and occasionally an exciting climax may be built up by the gradual addition of voices phrase by phrase (supported perhaps by a drum-roll *crescendo*) until a final *tutti* is reached. There is infinite scope here, provided that the speaking is musical and confident and the formal convention firmly established. A simple method of marking the verse-structure is to use the same pattern of division among speakers in strophe and antistrophe.

The grouping and movement of the Chorus poses another set of problems. To what extent should the Chorus 'dance'? Whatever the ancients did, we shall be wise to avoid any elaborate or self-conscious eurhythmics. Dignified processional movement will usually suffice, though some plays like the *Bacchae* may demand a more lively choreography in places. Special effects will be more striking if restricted to a few carefully chosen movements, and the same principle applies to arm gestures, which should be occasional but really well concerted. If our elders carry staves, the deployment of these will need thorough drilling.

The Chorus grouping demands extremely detailed planning before the first rehearsal. The producer is advised to assign a number to each member and to plot all positions on paper from beginning to end of the play. The patterns to be adopted

will depend in part on the various arrangements that are feasible with a given number of choreutae. In certain formations, sizing will also be a factor if a good line of heads is to be shown. Symmetrical grouping will in general accord best with the Greek aesthetic, but it is not enough to pose the Chorus in pleasing but arbitrary geometrical figures. The subject matter of the poetry may suggest a picture, as in the Parodos of the *Agamemnon*, where a long section is a stylized re-enactment of Iphigeneia's sacrifice. Otherwise the verse-structure and the pattern of division among the different speakers may be reinforced in visual terms according to the positions in which individual members are standing in relation to each other. Strophic correspondence can be presented to the eye as well as to the ear through the use of identical or complementary groupings in metrically equivalent stanzas. Adjustment in formation within odes may be made to indicate changes of mood or metre, and the amount of variation will depend on our assessment of an ode's function and content.

During the episodes, the Chorus should remain still and concentrated, following the action together with their eyes. Reactions should be bold, concerted and limited to moments of importance. Individual nods or grave shakes of the head can look very silly. Lines of stichomythia are best assigned to the Coryphaeus, a role which should be played by an actor of special dignity and authority. The leader should also take the iambic comments which often follow the long speeches. The function of these sometimes banal remarks was doubtless to allow the audience a brief moment to relax and shift their positions, and to make the Chorus declaim these lines in solemn unison is to invite ridicule and parody.

In conclusion it must once again be stressed that there can be no simple formula for the production of Greek Tragedy. A performance executed on the formal lines discussed in these articles could still be a deadly failure if it lacked wholeness and insight into the spirit of the play concerned or if the actors failed to compel attention. Drama is essentially an emotional experience

and the playing of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides demands intensity without sentimentality, restraint without inhibition, and inspiration without loss of dignity. H. D. F. Kitto speaks of classical Greek art as 'quivering with controlled excitement'. That is the key. We must feel the excitement and understand the nature of the control in all its formal and practical aspects. Then a play composed for performance at Athens nearly 2,500 years ago can once again be brought to life in much of its truth and beauty.

DAVID RAEBURN
is now Headmaster of Beckenham and Penge Grammar School
In 1955 and 1958 he produced the Greek Play at Bradfield College

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY DidasKalos

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."